

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BRIAN BORENSTEIN,  
Plaintiff(s),

v.

THE ANIMAL FOUNDATION, et al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:19-cv-00985-CDS-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 236]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery. Docket No. 236. Defendant The Animal Foundation filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 240. Plaintiff filed a reply. Docket No. 241. The motion is properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1. For the reasons discussed more fully below, the motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice.

The instant dispute boils down to what should be a fairly straightforward issue: must The Animal Foundation identify the new adopters of Mana. Plaintiff's papers provide a very brief recitation of the law, followed by what appears to be a meandering discussion sometimes addressing issues of limited pertinence to the matter at hand. *See* Docket No. 236. Plaintiff's papers also include completely unnecessary snark that is by no means helpful to the Court. *See, e.g.,* Docket No. 241 at 2 & n.1 (asserting that The Animal Foundation "suffers from a god complex," and then providing a lengthy definition). Defendant's papers are also unhelpful. Other than passing discussion of a county ordinance, the response provides no legal authority of any kind and does not meaningfully engage with the law. *See* Docket No. 240. The response also attempts to incorporate by reference arguments made elsewhere on the docket, *see id.* at 2 n.2, which is a

1 practice the Court will not indulge in this case, *cf. Lescinsky v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 539 F. Supp.  
2 3d 1121, 1129 n.8 (D. Nev. 2021).<sup>1</sup>

3 Accordingly, the motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice. Any renewed motion  
4 must be focused on the specific issues at hand, must be well-organized, and must be complete in  
5 of itself. Although the undersigned was only recently assigned to this matter, the Court is  
6 cognizant that this motion practice was filed several months ago. In an effort to avoid unnecessary  
7 delay, any renewed motion to compel on this issue must be filed by July 25, 2022, any response  
8 must be filed by August 1, 2022, and any reply must be filed by August 4, 2022.<sup>2</sup>

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: July 18, 2022

11   
12 Nancy J. Koppe  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> If The Animal Foundation is arguing that the instant dispute is foreclosed by prior orders,  
26 it is welcome to make that argument if supported by citation to the law, identification of the  
27 pertinent standards, and meaningful analysis applying those standards to the circumstances of this  
28 case. The Animal Foundation may not, however, simply assert that it has already presented  
argument elsewhere in the record.

<sup>2</sup> This order governs the briefing schedule regardless of any different dates that may be  
generated by CMECF. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule IC 3-1(d).